

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

Matthew Travis Houston,

Case No.: 2:23-cv-01349-JAD-BNW

Petitioner

V.

Jeremy Bean, *et al.*,

## **Order Denying Motions**

## Respondents

ECF Nos. 5, 5

I screened the petition for writ of habeas corpus in this case and dismissed the case

10 without prejudice on September 6, 2023.<sup>1</sup> I did so because the largely inscrutable petition does  
11 not appear to set forth any potentially meritorious claim that the custody of the petitioner,  
12 Matthew Travis Houston, violates federal law.<sup>2</sup> I denied Houston's application to proceed *in*  
13 *forma pauperis*, finding that he is able to pay the filing fee.<sup>3</sup> And I denied Houston a certificate  
14 of appealability because jurists of reason would not find debatable whether I was correct in  
15 dismissing this action.<sup>4</sup>

16 On September 25, 2023, Houston filed a motion for reconsideration,<sup>5</sup> which I construe as  
17 a motion for relief from judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b). Much like his  
18 petition,<sup>6</sup> Houston’s 288-page motion for reconsideration is largely incomprehensible and

<sup>1</sup> ECF No. 3.

<sup>2</sup> See *id.*

3 *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

23 | <sup>5</sup> ECF No. 5

|<sup>6</sup> ECF No. 1-1.

1 includes a great deal of material with little or no apparent connection to the subject of the  
 2 motion. Houston's motion does not make any showing that my September 6 order and resulting  
 3 judgment were affected by mistake, inadvertence, or any other factor warranting relief under  
 4 Rule 60(b).

5 While that motion was pending, Houston filed a "Renewed Emergency Suppliment [sic]  
 6 and Ex Parte Motion to Reinstate Screening/Briefing."<sup>7</sup> That filing, too, is incomprehensible and  
 7 appears to be a refiling of documents that Houston sent to, or received from, the United States  
 8 Supreme Court and the Supreme Court of Nevada.<sup>8</sup> Regardless, this document does not set forth  
 9 any legitimate request for, or basis to grant, any relief in this case.

10 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Petitioner's Motion for Reconsideration and  
 11 Response to Order Dismissing Action and Denying Application to Proceed *in Forma Pauperis*  
 12 [ECF No. 5] and his "Renewed Emergency Suppliment [sic] and Ex Parte Motion to Reinstate  
 13 Screening/Briefing" [ECF No. 6] are DENIED.

14 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a certificate of appealability relative to this order is  
 15 DENIED because jurists of reason would not find these rulings debatable.

16 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 25(d), Jeremy  
 17 Bean is substituted for Brian Williams, Sr., as the respondent warden. The Clerk of the Court is  
 18 directed to update the docket to reflect this change. THIS CASE REMAINS CLOSED.

19 \_\_\_\_\_  
 20 U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey  
 October 13, 2023

21 \_\_\_\_\_  
 22 \_\_\_\_\_  
 23 <sup>7</sup> ECF No. 6.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.*